

LONG RANGE PLANNING

TO: Plan Review Steering Committee
FROM: Long Range Planning Staff
DATE: October 20, 2000
SUBJECT: Summary Notes from the GMA Steering Committee meeting of
October 18, 2000

Attendance:

Steering Committee Members:

Darrell Alder	City of Washougal Council Member (P)
Jack Burkman	City of Vancouver Council Member (P)
Paul Dennis	City of Camas
Jeanne Harris	City of Vancouver Council Member (A)
John Idsinga	City of Battle Ground Council Member (P)
Betty Sue Morris	Clark County Board of Commissioners
Craig Pridemore	Clark County Board of Commissioners (Chair)
Judie Stanton	Clark County Board of Commissioners
Michael Hefflin	City of Ridgefield Council Member
	(P) Primary (A) Alternate

Public:

Marnie Allen	Clark County Schools
Jessica Hoffman	Clark County Association of Realtors
Dean Lookingbill	Regional Transportation Council
Alison Mielke	Friends of Clark County
Randy Printz	Landerholm Law Firm
Cathy Steiger	Self
Don Steinke	Self
George Vartanian	Self
Scott Walstra	SWCA

Staff:

Jose Alvarez	Clark County Long Range Planning
Monty Anderson	City of Washougal Planning Director
Bill Barron	Clark County Administrator

Alan Boguslawski	Clark County Community Development
Rich Carson	Clark County Community Development Director
Derek Chisholm	City of Vancouver Long Range Planning
Mike Conway	City of Washougal Public Works Director
Evan Dust	Clark County Long Range Planning
Eric Eisemann	Cities of La Center & Ridgefield
Lianne Forney	Clark County Public Outreach & Information Director
Mike Haggerty	C-Tran
Bob Higbie	Clark County Long Range Planning
Eric Holmes	City of Battle Ground Planning Director
Mary Keltz	Clark County Board of Commissioner's Office
Patrick Lee	Clark County Long Range Planning Manager
Rich Lowry	Clark County Chief Civil Deputy Prosecuting Attorney
Marty Snell	City of Camas Planning Manager
Brian Snodgrass	City of Vancouver Planner
Phil Wuest	Clark County Long Range Planning

Roll Call / Introductions

Called to order at 4:00 PM by Commissioner Craig Pridemore. Attendees introduced themselves and their affiliations.

Review September 14 Steering Committee Notes

No corrections. Notes accepted as published.

60/40 and 6/16 Issues

Eric Holmes summarized the memorandum from Clark County Cities to the Steering Committee dated October 17, 2000.

Representatives of the various city jurisdictions within the county have met independently to discuss the 60/40 policy because this combination is not currently working well for the smaller jurisdictions. They wish to seek an alternative that provides these jurisdictions some latitude to maintain their individual character while still meeting the county-wide density goals.

Mr. Holmes pointed out that the current policy does not take into consideration such things as the housing market, maintaining community character, affordability, and character of growth patterns. He also stated that it is not clear what the policy means, and noted some apparent inconsistencies between the Community Framework Plan and the Comprehensive Plan Policies. He stated that the cities group has come up with some recommended changes to Comp Plan, and turned the discussion over to Eric Eisemann.

Mr. Eisemann stated that the various cities are different; that a "one-size-fits-all" policy does not work for all cities because of size difference. So the group went back to the Community Framework Plan to try and establish a performance standard that would

have each city meet a certain density standard. They propose breaking the urban county down into four tiers:

- Regional Center (100,000+ population) (Vancouver)
- Major Centers (50,000 – 100,000 population)
- Large Centers (15,000 – 50,000)
- Small Centers (up to 15,000 population)

The group proposes that Comp Plan Goal 5.7 be changed from a 60:40 ratio to a minimum 75% single family detached. They also propose that the minimum average density goals be apportioned among the different “tiers” in accordance with the following:

<u>Tier</u>	<u>Minimum average density</u>
• Regional centers:	10 units/net acre
• Major centers:	8 units/net acre
• Large centers:	6 units/net acre
• Small centers	4 units/net acre

Finally, they propose that each jurisdiction be subject to compliance monitoring.

Steering Committee members asked a number of clarifying questions, and there was discussion of how to monitor compliance.

Commissioner Morris expressed concern that the proposal would result in the unincorporated areas of the county, such as Hazel Dell, bearing the brunt of density through new development.

Jack Burkman expressed concern whether 10 units per acre was a realistic goal for Vancouver. Eric Holmes agreed the number 10 might be too high, and said that it was just chosen for discussion purposes.

Commissioner Pridemore expressed concern that the density goals be equitably distributed across jurisdictions. There was also some discussion of the need to maintain a jobs/housing balance.

General Conclusions:

- Three tiers are preferred over four tiers.
- The Vancouver (Regional Center) minimum density threshold should be 8 units per acre, with the next two smaller tiers at 6 units per acre and 4 units per acre, respectively.
- For monitoring purposes, consider shifting the compliance back to the 1994 population and density base line. Monitoring should be done either annually or every five years.
- The policy needs to consider balancing the provision of housing and jobs.

- Enforcement mechanisms need to be added to the policy since there are clearly none now. The decision makers need some type of objective criteria with which to evaluate whether or not a jurisdiction is meeting the policy. Enforcement provisions need to be determined.

Preserving Transportation Corridors policy paper

Evan Dust presented TAC Policy Paper #11.

Future transportation corridors can be identified on a plan map, even if the actual highways are projected to be built at a time beyond the 20-year horizon of the Comprehensive Plan. The extent to which the locations are identified depend on the level of fiscal commitment. From drawing a generalized line on the plan map, to generating a corridor study, to projecting what the future level of use demand will be, to actually engineering the centerline alignment; each stage involves a higher level of cost.

Identifying such a corridor results in legal implications that make preserving these corridors from development a challenge. Rich Lowry explained some of the legal limitations the county would face in trying to protect property identified within the corridor from development that would hinder or preclude the future construction of the highway.

Commissioner Morris asked if the corridors could be put on the 20-year Arterial Atlas.

Evan Dust pointed out that designation of transportation corridors is a self-fulfilling prophecy, and questioned whether land use designations should dictate the location of transportation corridors or whether designation of transportation corridors should drive land use development.

Jeanne Harris emphasized the need to be proactive and plan for the transportation infrastructure in advance. John Idsinga echoed this sentiment and stated that we do need to draw the lines on the map.

Technical Advisory Committee Update

(See the 60/40 discussion above.)

Other

The next Steering Committee meeting is at 4:00 PM on October 26th at the Camas Police Station.

Committee members agreed that the November meeting be held on November 21st, location to be determined.

Adjourned

The Steering Committee adjourned at 5:37 PM.

h:\long range planning\projects\cpt 99.003 five year update\cpt 99-003 - steering committee\minutes - steering\steering committee - October 18 2000.doc